

what makes these costs and their cost to the local taxpayers all the more shocking.

Election officials in Alameda County, CA, told me recently that they spent almost \$100,000 to produce ballots in Spanish and Chinese for the entire country, yet only 900 were ultimately requested. You can do the math. The taxpayers of Alameda County spent over \$100 for every multilingual ballot that was actually used in that June 1994 election. This appears to be a trend.

The last election in Los Angeles saw ballots printed in six languages other than English. Among them were Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Tagalog, and Korean. It cost the city government over \$125,000 to prepare the materials. Yet, and listen to this, only 927 ballots were used. Los Angeles spent over \$135 for each voter the city helped.

Even small communities are not immune. Long Beach spent a relatively modest \$1,026 preparing multilingual materials for its eligible voters when only 22 requests came in. The township spent over \$280 per multilingual voter. As a frustrated election official told me recently, "This is a lot of money to help a few people." That official could not be more right.

These ballots have other, more serious costs associated with them, too. Providing these special services creates the fiction that newcomers to this country can enjoy the full benefits of citizenship without the language of the land, which is English. How can a citizen cast an informed ballot in a foreign language when most candidates' platforms, stump speeches, and media coverage are in English? Exercising one's rights of citizenship involves more than just casting a vote. It means making a thoughtful decision regarding an issue or a candidate.

Multilingual voting ballots give individuals the right to vote without granting the power to cast an informed vote. The logical extent of the argument behind the multilingual ballots is to provide these services in all the languages spoken in the country. After all, why should we privilege one linguistic minority over another? Should we not provide news reports and election coverage in all these languages, so these citizens have access to all the information they need to cast an informed vote? The simple and obvious answer is that we cannot. There are 327 languages spoken in the United States today. We cannot provide these services in all of these languages. What is more, we should not.

#### CALLING FOR A MUTUAL UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN TAIWAN AND THE PEOPLES REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, it is said that in history, great conflicts begin more often from miscalculation than by purposeful design. Even in our own time, it is said that the Korean war may have begun by the unfortunate statement of Mr. Avenuees that the defense perimeter of the United States began in the Sea of Japan, and not the 38th parallel.

A few years ago the United States Ambassador to Iraq suggested to Saddam Hussein that in a dispute between Kuwait and Iraq, the United States would regard the matter as an internal problem in the Arab world. Today in the straits of Taiwan a foundation may be being laid for a similar misunderstanding.

I take the floor today, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of this institution, in the hope that the leaders of our country, our great allies in the People's Republic of China, come to some mutual understanding of events that are taking shape even as we speak between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

Only weeks ago the Peoples Republic fired missiles into the airspace and the shipping lanes around Taiwan. It is now openly being discussed what further actions, including military measures, might be taken. The leaders in Beijing are displeased with comments or activities of President Li after the Taiwanese elections.

It is the policy of the United States Government to have formal diplomatic relations with the People's Republic and to recognize it as the sole legitimate Government of China, but the Taiwan Relations Act is infinitely more complex. It also permits, and indeed, in my judgment, provides a responsibility for the United States Government to continually reassess our role and obligations if the security situation of Taiwan were to deteriorate.

I recognize that the relationship between Beijing and Washington is one of the cornerstones of world peace. It is one of this Nation's most important economic, cultural, and security relationships. I want it to be strong and I want it to be sound. But I also recognize, and history bears witness, the United States keeps its obligations, recognizes its relationships, and meets the needs of its friends.

I trust and I hope that Beijing in the coming months will act responsibly, retain the commitment that any dispute it might have with the people on Taiwan and the question of the larger China is resolved peacefully, responsibly, and diplomatically. But simply because Members of this institution and the larger U.S. Government are committed to good relations with Beijing, simply because we want good political relationships, increased investment and trade, simply because of the progress of all these years, they should not put aside that this is still a nation that keeps its obligations, defends the weak against the strong, and holds democratic governments with

pluralistic governments in a singular and special category.

This is, after all, not the Taiwan of 20 years ago. There is a free press, a pluralist democracy, and now, a popularly elected President. That does not negate aspects of, or in its totality, the Taiwan Relations Act. It is simply an attempt to make an effort on my own part to communicate with the leaders in Beijing to let them know that the firing of the missiles was not only wrong, but threatening military action is irresponsible.

However they may calculate it, whatever their advisers may say, at the end of the day, in spite of all the investment and all the hopes for good relations with China, the world will not watch a military incursion, a renewal of hostilities, or even irresponsible acts that threaten the peace.

So I hope each in our private ways, parties to this potential dispute, will again renew their commitment to peace and ensure that our actions remain responsible, but that all parties at the end of the day recognize that the United States will not witness the forceful end of the Government of Taiwan.

#### TRAVEL HABITS OF THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER] is recognized for 40 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Commerce Department has made news. But it's not news about any new trade deals it won for American business. It's for the travel habits of the Secretary of Commerce. It seems that the Secretary has a penchant for travel, one that has cost the taxpayers of this country millions of dollars.

In fact, the current Secretary's travel costs have increased by over 145 percent from that of his predecessor. One can only assume he is using the same travel agency as the Secretary of Energy.

This weekend, the Los Angeles Times reported that the Department of Commerce's own inspector general was sharply critical of Secretary Ron Brown's travel expenses, noting that "His spending levels are particularly striking since he took over the job from a Republican administration that was often under fire for incurring excessive travel costs."

The Los Angeles Times goes on to add, "Brown, a former chairman of the Democratic Party, was accused by his critics of using his travel budget to gain favor with political allies and party contributors, many of whom have been invited to accompany the secretary on his extensive foreign trips."

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Los Angeles Times article.